

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In view of Applicant's arguments, the Examiner withdraws the rejection under 35 USC 102(b) to claims 10-12 with Kapadia's reference. However, the claims are not in a condition for allowance in view of new ground of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Regarding claims 10-12, the limitation "wherein no magnetic field (Fig. 9) produced, by the permanent magnets passes through the rotating shaft (or any magnetic field produced by the permanent magnets bypasses the rotating shaft as in claim 11, or any magnetic field produced by the permanent magnets passes through only the rotor yoke, excluding the rotating shaft (claim 12)" is not understood by an ordinary skill in the art because the specification does not explain why the magnetic field shown in Fig. 30 of the present invention can not pass through the rotating shaft. Even though the shaft is made of non-magnetic material, a portion of the field produced by

Art Unit: 2834

the magnets must pass through the shaft because one end of end of the magnet is adjacent to the shaft, the flux lines induce by one end of end of the magnet must go through the shaft. It is noted that the relative location of the magnet to the shaft in the present invention is the same as the relative location of the magnet to the shaft of Fig. 2 of Kapadia's reference. If a portion of the flux in Kapadia's reference passes through the shaft, it is inherent that a portion of the flux in the present invention also passes through the shaft.

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh N Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-2031. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Darren Schuberg, can be reached on (571) 272-2044. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and (571) 273-8300 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1000.

HNN

June 16, 2008

Application/Control Number: 10/692,865
Art Unit: 2834

Page 4

/Nguyen N Hanh/

Examiner, Art Unit 2834